# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/122,484 | 07/24/1998 | TERESA FARIAS LATTER | 8285/181 | 4450 |

757          7590          08/01/2005

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| NGUYEN, DUC MINH |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2643 | |

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

## *Supplemental Examiner's Answer*

Responsive to Reply Brief filed on 05/12/05, a supplemental Examiner's Answer is set

forth below:

| Regarding the Bartholomew reference, appellant states that Bartholomew fails to disclose the feature determining whether standard caller ID for the calling communication station can be provided to the called communication station by analyzing data contained within a query. | In contrast to appellant's assertions, Bartholomew teaches a switch (SSP 11-17, fig(s). 2; column(s) 5, line(s) 27-52) operative to generate a query in response to the receipt of a call, wherein the query includes the telephone number associated with the calling communication station (e.g., TCAP query includes a "service key" which is the calling party's address and digits representing the called party address, **column(s) 6, line(s) 6-19**); a service control point (ISCP 40, fig(s). 2) coupled with the switch, the SCP being operative to determine whether standard caller ID information for the calling communication station can be provided to the called communication station by analyzing information contained within the query (e.g., comparing the calling party's address or calling party number (CPN) with data stored in the |

call processing record (CPR) to determine whether the caller ID is designated in the CPR as a blocked number or not; **column(s) 6, line(s) 40 to column(s) 7, line(s) 62**). It is further noted that claims 57-60, 68-69, 70-71, 91-93 broadly recite generating a query in response to the receipt of a call, wherein the query includes the telephone number associated with the calling communication station. Column(s) 6, line(s) 5-20 and line(s) 40-59 clearly disclose that the switch generates a query in response to the receipt of a call, wherein the query includes the telephone number associated with the calling communication station. The ISCP then **[Emphasis added]** analyzes the query to determine whether standard caller ID information of the calling communication station can be provided to the called communication station (e.g., comparing the calling party's address or calling party number (CPN) with data stored in the call processing

| | record (CPR) to determine whether the caller ID is designated in the CPR as a blocked number or not; **column(s) 6, line(s) 60 through column(s) 7, line(s) 62**). |
|---|---|

| Appellant further argues that the combination of the references fails to teach the feature "transmitting a message to the called communication station where the message comprises accept and reject options." | With respect to dependent claim 64, Tatchell's column(s) 21, line(s) 30-40 suggests that the agent provides options to the subscriber (e.g., accept, reject or redirect the call). |
|---|---|

| Appellant further argues that the combination of the references fails to teach the feature "transmitting a message to the calling communication station in response to input from called communication station." | With respect to dependent claims 65 and 93, Tatchell's column(s) 21, line(s) 30-40 clearly teaches transmitting a message to the calling communication in response to input (either by voice response (IVR) or by DTMF; see column(s) 11, line(s) 25-33; column(s) 16, line(s) 28-30; column(s) 21; line(s) 65 to column(s) 22, line(s) 8; column(s) 22, line(s) 36-38) from the called communication station (e.g., if the call is rejected 117, the agent forwards or sends the call to screen block |
|---|---|

| | announcement). |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| Appellant further argues that the combination of the references does not yield a system whereby a calling party is asked to "speak the name of the party upon whose behalf he or she is calling." | Bartholomew'119 teaches transmitting a request for the calling party to speak the name of the calling party (column(s) 43, line(s) 11-36) for the purposes of identifying individual who has been identified by voice only (e.g., caller id is not detected). It appears that the feature "speak the name of the party upon whose behalf he or she is calling" would depend more upon the choice of the subscriber to request the identification information of the caller than on any inventive concept. |

| |
|---|
| It is further noted that appellant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). |
| |

Appellant may file another reply brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.41 within two

months of the date of mailing of this supplemental examiner's answer. Extensions of time under

37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to this two month time period. See 37 CFR 41.43(b)-(c).

A Technology Center Director or designee has approved this supplemental examiner's
answer by signing below:

*Mark R. Powell*

*DIRECTOR 2600*